ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.   PATENT APPLICATION
06897.P003   10/814,093
Confirmation No. 7295

9

REMARKS

Applicant has carefully reviewed the Application in light of the Office Action mailed November 25, 2009. At the time of the Office Action, Claims 1-17, 26 and 27 were pending in the Application and stand rejected. Applicant has amended several Independent Claims in an effort to expedite the prosecution of the instant case. The amendments are not the result of any Prior Art reference and, thus, do not narrow the scope of any of the claims. Furthermore, the amendments are not related to patentability issues and only further clarify subject matter already present. Applicant respectfully requests reconsideration of the pending claims and favorable action in this case.

Section 103 Rejection

Claims 1-17 and 26-27 are rejected as being unpatentable over U.S. Patent No. 7,185,073 B1 issued to Gai et al. (hereinafter "*Gai*") in view of "Cryptographic Hash Functions" issued to Bart Preneel (hereinafter "*Preneel*").

Applicant respectfully reminds the Examiner that to establish a *prima facie* case of obviousness, three basic criteria must be met. First, there must be some suggestion or motivation, either in the references themselves or in the knowledge generally available to one of ordinary skill in the art, to modify the reference or to combine reference teachings. Second, there must be a reasonable expectation of success. Third, the prior art reference (or references when combined) must teach or suggest all of the claim limitations.[1]

It is respectfully submitted that the rejected claims are patentable over the art of record based on at least the third criterion of obviousness: none of the references alone or in combination teach, suggest, or disclose each claim limitation of the Independent Claims.

---

[1] *See* M.P.E.P. §2142-43.

Independent Claim 1, as amended, recites:

1.   A computer readable medium having stored thereon data representing instructions that, when executed by a processor, cause the processor to perform operations comprising:
generating a tag describing an object **of a communication** captured during transmission **of the communication** from an origination address to a destination address**, extracted from the communication, and stored in a memory block**, wherein the tag includes,
        a source address field to indicate an origination address of the object,
        a destination address field to indicate a destination address of the object,
        a source port field to indicate an origination port of the object,
        a destination port field to indicate a destination port of the object,
        a content field to indicate a content type from a plurality of content types identifying a type of content contained in the object, and
        a time field to indicate when the object was captured; and
storing the tag in a database, wherein the tag indexes the object in **the memory block**, the tag being stored to allow subsequent searching for the **object** based on one or more of the fields, wherein **the fields are obtained from the communication**.

First, no reference includes a feature of an object of a communication *"captured during transmission of the communication…, extracted from the communication, and stored in a memory block."* As previously and correctly asserted, *Gai* is directed to traffic management of data packets traversing through networks.   In *Gai*, however, there is no object of a communication captured, extracted, and stored as recited in Independent claim 1, much less a tag describing such object being stored to permit the subsequent searching for the object in the memory block based on the fields of the tag. In addition, *Gai* does not teach generating a tag describing an object of a communication in which the fields of the tag are obtained from the communication. There are simply no teachings in *Gai* or any of the cited references applicable to these limitations in Independent Claim 1.

For at least these reasons, Independent Claim 1 is easily allowable over any cited reference, or combination of references. The other Independent Claims recite limitations similar, but not identical, to those recited in Independent Claim 1. Therefore, these claims are also allowable, for example, for the same reasons as identified above. Additionally, the corresponding dependent claims from these Independent Claims are also patentably distinct for

analogous reasons. Notice to this effect is respectfully requested in the form of a full allowance

of these claims.

CONCLUSION

Applicant has now made an earnest attempt to place this case in condition for immediate allowance. For the foregoing reasons and for all other reasons clear and apparent, Applicant respectfully requests reconsideration and allowance of the pending claims.

An Information Disclosure Statement is being filed simultaneously herewith. The Information Disclosure Statement fee in the amount of $180 for late submission of §1.17(p) is being paid concurrently herewith via the Electronic Filing System (EFS) by way of Deposit Account No. 50-4889 authorization. No additional fees are believed due. However, please apply any other charges or credit any overpayment to Deposit Account No. 50-4889 of PATENT CAPITAL GROUP, referencing the attorney docket number referenced above.

If there are matters that can be discussed by telephone to advance prosecution of this application, Applicant invites the Examiner to contact Thomas J. Frame at 214-823-1241.

Respectfully submitted,

Patent Capital Group
Attorneys for Applicant

/Thomas J. Frame/
Thomas J. Frame
Reg. No. 47,232

Date: February 25, 2010
Customer No. 78855